

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

In the Office Action, claims 1-3 and 26-38 were pending. Upon entry of the present paper, claims 33 and 37 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, claims 1, 3, 31, 35 and 36 are amended, and new claims 39-42 are added. The rejections were as follows:

- Claims 1-3, 26, 29 and 31-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of an alleged combination of *Park et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,714,799) and *Blood et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,456,706);
- Claims 35-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over an alleged combination of *Park et al.*, *Blood et al.* and *Anvekar* (U.S. Patent No. 6,684,072);
- Claims 27-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over an alleged combination of *Park et al.*, *Anvekar* and *Lobo* (U.S. Patent No. 7,054,658);
- Claims 30 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over an alleged combination of *Park et al.*, *Lobo*, *Link, II et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,334,054) and *Haas et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,615,036)

#### **Independent Claim 1, and Dependent Claims 2-3, 26-30 and 39-42**

Amended independent claim 1 recites, among other features, the “table identifies a plurality of home and registered network pairs and one or more different incoming call routing operations for each of said pairs.” None of the applied references teaches or suggests the claim 1 apparatus with such a table. The primary reference cited in the Office Action for a table is *Lobo*. The *Lobo* lookup table (206/306) defines a number of different pulse functions to be used for telephone transmissions, and those functions are selected based on cost (or error) functions. See, e.g., col. 10, lines 18-20. There is no teaching or suggestion in *Lobo* of a table identifying the home/registered network pairs recited in amended claim 1, or of the incoming call routing operations (*Lobo* uses its pulse function for modulating an outgoing transmission).

The other references do not overcome this deficiency. The Office Action already concedes that *Park et al.* fails to teach or suggest the originally-recited table. The *Anvekar et al.* phone relies on the Mobile Switching Center (MSC) and Service Processing Node (SPN) to handle incoming calls while roaming, and does not teach or suggest such a table. See, e.g., col. 6, line 64 to col. 7, line 48. The *Blood et al.* screening device is connected in the user's home, and there is no teaching or suggestion of including such a table (indeed, it does not roam or register itself). *Haas et al.* relates to downloading a voice mail message, without reference to roaming or registration, and although *Link II et al.* uses a de-registration signal to simulate the user turning his/her phone off (col. 2, lines 55-56), there is no teaching or suggestion of the recited table.

For at least these reasons, we submit that amended independent claim 1 distinguishes over the applied references. Claims 2-3, 26-30 and 39-42 depend from claim 1, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, and further in view of the features recited therein. For example, new claim 39 recites country code and network code information for the first and second information, and claim 41 recites displaying "an indication of a roaming status of said apparatus, and a message indicating how future incoming calls will be handled based on said roaming status."

#### **Independent Claim 31, and Dependent Claims 32 and 34**

Amended independent claim 31 recites, among other features, "a table identifying a plurality of sets of home country code information, home network code information, registered country code information and registered network code information, and for each set, an identification of an incoming call handling operation to be performed by the mobile

communication apparatus in response to an incoming call, and a time period for permitting the operation.” None of the applied references stores such a table identifying such a plurality of sets of information. As noted above, the cited lookup table from *Lobo* is based on cost (or error) functions, and not on the home or registered network, and there is no teaching or suggestion in *Lobo* that its transmitter will include such a table.

The other applied references do not overcome this deficiency, for much of the same reasons discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant submits that amended claim 31 distinguishes over the applied references. Claims 32 and 34 depend from claim 31, and are distinguishable for at least the same reasons as claim 31, and further in view of the various features recited therein.

**Independent Claim 35, and Dependent Claims 36 and 38**

Amended independent claim 35 recites, among other features, the controller being configured to “display, on a display of said apparatus, an indication of said roaming status; and display, on said display of said apparatus, a message indicating a location to which future incoming calls will be routed based on said roaming status.” The Office Action previously relied on *Anvekar et al.* for the notion of displaying a roaming status, citing col. 5, line 36 to col. 6, line 18 and Fig. 7). As an initial matter, the cited portions only describe a roaming authentication; they make no mention of displaying a roaming status. Even assuming, *arguendo*, that displaying a roaming status on the phone would be obvious (as alleged), there is no teaching or suggestion of displaying the message indicating a location to which future incoming calls will be routed based on said roaming status, as claimed in amended claim 35.

**CONCLUSION**

All rejections having been addressed, Applicant respectfully submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. However, if the Examiner believes that further discussion and/or amendment is necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's undersigned representative at the number appearing below.

Respectfully submitted,  
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: October 9, 2006

By: /Steve Chang/  
Steve S. Chang, Registration No. 42,402

1001 G Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597  
Tel: (202) 824-3000  
Fax: (202) 824-3001